REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated January 26, 2005.

The Examiner has objected to claims 22 and 26 because of informalities.

Claims 16-28 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 29-33 which are rewritten from claims 22, 24-26 and 28 in order to overcome the objection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yu (U.S. 20020163955 (published 11/07/20020). Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 16-17, 21 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated Egawa et al (U.S. 5232284). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 16-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Pompei (U.S. 6219573). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pompei (U.S. 6219573) in view of CN1304129A. Also, the Examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pompei in view of Dotan. Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pompei in view of Intractor. Further still, the Examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egawa in view of Hasagawa. Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claims 22, 24-26, 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16-28 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 29-33 which are rewritten from claims 22, 24-26 and 28 in order to overcome the objections and rejections.

6

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Leong Ch. 2. Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

June 20, 2005